



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/641,378	08/13/2003	Binz DeWalch	D30473USC2 (PAT-DDD CIPA)	9613
7590 11/14/2006			EXAMINER	
DeWALCH TECHNOLOGIES, INC. 6850 WYNNWOOD LANE HOUSTON, TX 77008			KIM, SUN U	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1723	

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/641,378

Applicant(s)

DEWALCH, BINZ

Examiner

John Kim

Art Unit

1723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-97 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-71 and 90-97 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 72-89 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/13/03.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1723

1. Claims 2-71 and 90-97 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR

1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 8/28/06.

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to **a single paragraph** on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Appropriate correction is required.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Continuity data of 09/658,017 and 09/532,599 should be updated as "abandoned" in page 1 of the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

4. Claims 83 and 85-89 objected to because of the following informalities: "the tube" should be changed to "the vessel" to avoid lack of antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1723

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Forsythe, Jr. et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,214,993). Forsythe, Jr. et al disclose a tube "32" having open and closed ends and a filtering means proximate the closed end of the tube "32", i.e. "16" which includes filtering material in a lower portion thereof "24" (col. 3, lines 6-40).

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shapiro (U.S. Patent No. 3,52,940). Shapiro discloses a tube "11" having open and closed ends and a filtering means "15" disposed adjacent a closed end thereof (Figure 2).

8. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Card (U.S. Patent No. 4,643,981). Card discloses a tube "11" having a filtering means "15" disposed adjacent a closed end "12" thereof (Figure 2).

9. Claims 72-73, 81 and 87-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dorn et al (U.S. Patent No. 3,875,012).

Regarding claims 72-73, Dorn et al disclose a tube comprising a hollow body (12) having a pierceable closed end (14) and a liquid filtering medium (42) i.e. retaining substance (Figures 1, 4; col. 3, line 34 – col. 4, line 62).

Regarding claim 81, Dorn et al teach a gel (col. 4, lines 55-62).

Regarding claims 87-89, Dorn et al teach that a recess on the inside and in the center of the closed end of the tube which constitutes a groove (Figure 1; col. 3, line 63 – col. 4, line 14).

10. Claims 72-76, 83-84 and 87-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ayres et al (U.S. Patent No. 3,931,010).

Art Unit: 1723

Regarding claims 72-73, Ayres et al disclose a tube comprising a hollow body (12) having a pierceable closed end (16) and a filter i.e. retaining substance capable of filtering serum or plasma (Figure 1; col. 2, line 49 – col. 3, line 65).

Regarding claims 74-76, Ayres et al teach waterproof filter paper, fibers and glass wool (col. 3, lines 57-63).

Regarding claims 83-84, Ayres et al teach that a gap interposed between the retaining substance (60) and the closed end of the tube (16) by a supporting means (32, 34) (Figure 2).

Regarding claims 87-89, Ayres et al teach that a recess on the inside and in the center of the closed end (16) of the tube (12) which constitutes a groove (Figure 1).

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 77 and 79-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayres et al as applied to claim 72 above and further in view of Kozak et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,460,974). Ayres et al teach a tube as described in above paragraph 10. Ayres et al teach the use of any suitable filter material chemically inert to blood and capable of filtering serum or plasma including fibrous or particulate material (col. 3, lines 57-63).

Claims 77 and 79-82 essentially differ from the tube of Ayres et al in reciting solid phase extraction media (claim 77), beads (claim 79), silica (claim 80), gel (claim 81) and surface coating (claim 82). Kozak et al teach various filter materials capable of separating plasma or serum from blood including silica gel, cellulosic beads (col. 15, line 59 – col. 16, line 53) and

Art Unit: 1723

glass fiber matrix coated with agglutinin, coagulant or mixture thereof (col. 24, line 61 – col. 25, line 12). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute known filtering material as disclosed in Kozak et al for the filtering material of Ayres et al in the tube for separating serum or plasma from blood.

13. Claims 72-73, 75-77, 79, 81, 83-85 and 87-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forsythe, Jr. et al. in view of Finney et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,358,425). Forsythe, Jr. et al disclose a centrifuge tube “32” having a closed end and a filtering material “26” i.e. a retaining substance in a filtering means “16” (Figures 1-2).

Claim 72 essentially differs from the tube of Forsythe, Jr. et al in reciting a closed end being pierceable. Finney et al teach a centrifuge tube with a pierceable bottom (Figure 1; col. 2, lines 16-42). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the tube of Forsythe, Jr. et al to incorporate a pierceable bottom at the closed end of the tube to extract desired constituents from the tube as suggested by Finney et al (col. 2, lines 37-43).

Regarding claim 73, Forsythe, Jr. et al teach a filter “26” (Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 46-50).

Regarding claims 75-77, 79 and 81, Forsythe, Jr. et al teach polyester fiber, glass beads, ion exchange resins and agarose gel beads (col. 4, lines 10-54).

Regarding claims 83-85, Forsythe, Jr. et al teach that the filtering material “26” is spaced above the closed end of the tube “32” by linear projections “29” disposed radially from the center of the closed end of the tube “32” (Figure 2; col. 4, lines 1-9).

Regarding claims 87-88, Forsythe, Jr. et al teach that the closed end includes a recess generally in the center thereof (col. 3, lines 64-68).

Art Unit: 1723

14. Claims 72-74, 76, 78 and 83-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro in view of Finney et al. Shapiro discloses a tube "11" having a closed end and a retaining substance (Figure 1).

Claim 72 essentially differs from the tube of Shapiro in reciting a closed end being pierceable. Finney et al teach a centrifuge tube with a pierceable bottom (Figure 1; col. 2, lines 16-42). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the tube of Shapiro to incorporate a pierceable bottom at the closed end of the tube to extract desired constituents from the tube as suggested by Finney et al (col. 2, lines 37-43).

Regarding claim 73, Shapiro teaches a filter "15" (Fig. 1).

Regarding claims 74, 76 and 78, Shapiro teaches glass filter paper cup "41" (Fig. 4; col. 3, lines 50-67).

Regarding claims 83-84, Shapiro teaches that the filtering material "15" is supported above the closed end of the tube "11" by shoulder "31" (Figure 2; col. 3, lines 68-75).

15. Claims 72-73, 83-84 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Savas et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,800,020) in view of Finney et al. Savas et al disclose a tube "C" having a closed end and retaining substance "64" (Figure 5).

Claim 72 essentially differs from the tube of Savas et al in reciting a closed end being pierceable. Finney et al teach a centrifuge tube with a pierceable bottom (Figure 1; col. 2, lines 16-42). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the tube of Savas et al to incorporate a pierceable bottom at the

Art Unit: 1723

closed end of the tube to extract desired constituents from the tube as suggested by Finney et al (col. 2, lines 37-43).

Regarding claim 73, Savas et al teach a filter "64" (Fig. 5; col. 4, lines 42-50).

Regarding claims 83-84 and 86, Savas et al teach that the filtering material "64" is spaced above the closed end of the tube "C" by linear projections "29" disposed radially from the center of the closed end of the tube "32" by accurate circular projection "24" to provide gap between the filter "64" and the closed end of the tube "C" (col. 3, lines 64-66 and col. 4, lines 65-67).


16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. References cited in PTO-892 teach tube containing filtering material.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-1142. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7 a.m. - 3:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Kim can be reached on 571-272-1142. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1723

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


John Kim
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1723

JK
November 8, 2006